DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 974 JC 700 131

TITLE	A Report to the Commission on Instruction of the American Association of Junior Colleges.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Mar 70
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Criteria, *Evaluation Methods, *Evaluation Techniques, Instructional Improvement, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The development of a rationale and of a tentative set of guidelines for evaluating community junior college instruction is the focus of this report. Initially discussed is the range of purposes for which instructor evaluation might be undertaken, including promotion, tenure, and improvement of instruction. The choice of evaluators is then discussed, and students, academic administrators, and colleagues are considered. Next, student and instructor performance are investigated as criteria for evaluation. Finally, methods and techniques of evaluation are covered, with emphasis on the potential of electronic recording systems. Concluding the report are appendices outlining evaluation procedures, purposes, and guidelines; sample instructor evaluation criteria; and tables of current evaluation factors in use and their frequency of employment. (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038974

A REPORT

TO THE COMMISSION ON INSTRUCTION

of the

American Association of Junior Colleges

from the

COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

Donald C. Bridgman
Richard J. Ernst
Sheila S. Polishook
Walter Washington
Richard W. Hostrip
Duane D. Anderson, Chairman

March, 1970

JC 700 131

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 22 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

PREFACE

The Committee on Evaluation of Instruction for 1970 was organized on April 9, 1969, with Duane D. Anderson designated as chairman. In attempting to organize the Committee the chairman contacted the members on June 5 and elicited suggestions for the years study. A second letter on October 13 attempted to arrive at some structure for the Committee's investigation. Several members of the Committee, because of moving to new positions, were unable to participate in the Committee's work; and a follow-up letter in February, 1970, indicated to the group that a very tentative report would be made ready for the Commission meeting which unfortunately would not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of all members of the Committee. Therefore, the chairman must take responsibility for any errors of omission or misstatement which occur in this report.

The 1969 Committee on Evaluation recommended that before the Commission on Instruction take a position on the question of evaluation and recognition, we should discover what forms of evaluation are presently being used and identify exactly what it is we want evaluated. It was hoped that the AAJC would sponsor a comprehensive survey of existing evaluation programs during the year; however, this did not materialize and remains a viable recommendation from this years Committee as well.

The 1970 Committee on Evaluation undertook the tasks of establishing a rationale for evaluating community junior college instruction and attempted to develop a tentative set of guidelines to be considered when and if such an action is implemented by two year institutions. It is recognized that several other agencies are involved in this or closely related activities and an attempt should be made to coordinate our efforts. The NFA Commission on Faculty Evaluation, for example, is attempting to "design a model which eliminates subjective, irregular methods of evaluation and replaces them with honest, valid procedures which guarantee due process."

Little empirical or statistical evidence is available from which to draw conclusions concerning the effectiveness of existing programs. The Committee recommends that such data be collected, if possible, to provide a basis on which evaluation systems might be improved. The Committee recognized the multi-faceted nature of the important approaches to the problem nor does it feel it has necessarily brought these issues into the most meaningful perspective. It is hoped that the information collected regarding several of the major concerns in the area of evaluation of community college instruction will prove to be either helpful or provocative enough to encourage further study in this area.

BACKGROUND OF EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Most of the early work done in this area of evaluation centered around the assessment of "teacher competencies" and the building of models by which "teacher efficiency" could be measured.

While it is undoubtedly important to attempt to identify a relationship between teacher characteristics and teacher effectiveness, there has been little demonstrated evidence to show that this can be done. Work by Barr and Ryans, as well as most of the research compiled by Biddle and Ellena, seem to lead to the conclusion that "good people make good teachers" which adds little to our understanding of how to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction which takes place in the community college classroom.

The problems of assessing instructional effectiveness in higher education are compounded by the reluctance on the part of instructors at this level to having either their procedure or product measured. The lack of acceptable standards for evaluating instructional practice and the almost impossible task of dictating personal and social attributes deemed necessary for successful college instructors, makes this line of research seem quite unprofitable.

John Gustad, in commenting on the report of the survey conducted by the Committee on College Teaching of the American Council on Education in 1960, felt that a "perfectly reliable and valid system of evaluation may, in fact, be for the forseeable future unattainable. Nevertheless, the history of learning, particularly science, would seem to support the notion that given time, effort, and the kind of critical appraisal that identifies blind alleys, reasonable approximations to a goal can be obtained." This kind of effort, however, will only be made if the system of rewards now used by institutions of higher education are drastically altered. It is in this regard that the community college should be able to forge ahead in this important area because of its lack of traditional commitment to other and much less effective practices of recognition and reward now being followed by four year institutions and other practices just as ineffective being used by the high schools. While the 1966 report by the American Council on Education indicated that classroom teaching was the most important factor in assessing faculty members, it is quite generally accepted that "lip service" only is given to this area and the major criterion followed by four year institutions are research and publication. This comprehensive study also indicated that very few colleges were actually working on this problem and that the majority reported that they were satisfied with their present methods of assessment.

Most research reported in the literature in the area of faculty evaluation has occurred in four year institutions, with the bulk of this research taking place in the area of student rating forms. While this type of evaluation in four year institutions could have a salutatory effect on the improvement of instrucation in those courses where the instructors encourage this type of activity, it is quite likely that those are the very areas where the best teaching is currently going on and that in the areas needing improvement, most instructors will not be willing to avail themselves of this kind of feedback information. It is also quite well understood by all members of the four year college community that recognition, promotion, and tenure will not be influenced greatly by evidence of successful teaching. While occasional exceptions to this rule are enthusiastically pointed out by those in charge of issuing these rewards and while an occasional reward for outstanding service is made, the rewarding of teacher effectiveness on the scale necessary to motivate and stimulate large numbers of four year college faculty members to devote time and energy to this end is unlikely to come about.

The reward system in the secondary school is likewise inappropriate for the task of improving instruction at the community college level. The single salary schedule with increases based on longevity and credit hours earned beyond the bachelor's or master's degree, even when coupled with classroom visitations and extensive checklists and rating form devices for evaluating conformity to the norm, will not lead to improved instruction at the community college level. The objectives of both the university and the secondary school deviate markedly from that of the community college. While all three levels profess to be teaching institutions and place great emphasis on student learning, the custodial nature of the secondary school and the research emphasis of the university pose real limitations on their using student learning as the major criterion of their success. The community college, on the other hand, has as its only reason for being that of teaching. If in this institution effective teaching resulting in demonstrable learning on the part of students is not accomplished, there is no other legitimate reason for its existence. The community college does not engage in the production of new knowledge, as does the university, nor do compulsory education laws dictate that all members of society need be served by it.

The emphasis in evaluation seems to be shifting from what the teacher is or does to what the learner is capable of demonstrating. Once clearly identified objectives can be established and agreed upon as being those behaviors necessary for success by the person who is the recipient of the instruction, evaluation will consist of measuring the degree to which the learner has attained those objectives and perhaps those instructor activities which can be proven to contribute to increased student learning.

Accept'd

The term accountability, now being used by many outside agencies that are providing funds for the support of programs and institutions seems to carry with it the notion that there is the expectation that the products of instruction can be measured. The term also carries the expectation that a reasonable quantity and quality product will be produced from the resources expended.

Perhaps the snare into which the behaviorists have led those interested in writing objectives and evaluating the effectiveness of instruction is the assumption that it is only what the learner can do and not what he thinks about what he is doing that is of value. It would appear that the criteria which must be established will have to take into account both of these instructional outcomes: (1) student achievement, and (2) student satisfaction. Most people would agree that we will have accomplished very little if as a result of our instructional approach the student is capable of responding in such a manner as to demonstrate his mastery of the concept taught while at the same time his attitude toward that concept and his willingness to apply it or to engage in further study of it have been destroyed by the instructional approach. As guidelines are established for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness for community college faculty members, we hope that these two facets will be kept in mind and will influence in some way the decisions relating to the criteria used, the techniques employed, the individuals who do the evaluating, and the use to which the results are put.

Should community colleges be involved in the evaluation of teacher or teaching effectiveness. If so, for what purposes? Who should be involved in such evaluation? What criteria should be used? What instruments, methods, approaches should be employed? These are the questions that the Commission on Instruction and the community colleges must come to grips with in the very near future.

The answer to the first question, whether we want to think so or not, may have already been answered by economic and political realities.

The question of why we evaluate has many ramifications ranging from philosophical positions to the everyday realities of promotion, tenure, and dismissal of faculty members faced by administrators in every community college. Logan Wilson, in 1942, stated, "Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the most critical problem confronted in the social organization of any university is the proper evaluation of faculty services and getting due recognition through the impartial assignments of status." The developments of the last quarter of a century, especially in the community college field, have only served to sharpen and intensify this problem. We in the community college evaluate instruction because it is our "thing." The reasons why we should not evaluate instruction are oftentimes more revealing that the rather well known list of statements why we should. Gustad, in discussing this issue, states "To some the

concern with improving procedures for evaluating teaching seem nothing less than the expression of an obsessive, compulsive neurosis. Those who have learned to use the darkness for their own purposes will probably not welcome the light."

Gage, in his article "Ends and Means in Appraising College Teaching" identified three important reasons for evaluating teaching. First, the use of this evidence by administrators on which they can base decisions concerning promotions, salary increases, and tenure. Second, and the reason most often identified as the most important, is as the basis for the improvement of instruction. One soon learns, however, that once the rhetoric is stripped away little instructional improvement results from evaluation procedures now practiced and little can be expected in the future unless the results of such practices can be used to recognize and reward. The third reason for evaluation given by Gage has to do with gathering data on which to base further research on more effective teaching and learning.

An evaluation instrument contained in the appendix of this report (source unknown) identifies the following seven reasons or purposes of evaluation:

1. To determine achievement of the objectives held by the school. Those responsible need to be aware of the successes and failures in the program.

2. To provide the basis for giving recognition for superior and effective service.

3. To provide the basis for self-improvement. The evaluated instructor needs evidence of his strengths and weaknesses. Those responsible need the same evidence to encourage and aid improvement or take indicated actions.

4. To provide the basis for motivation. Uses of incentives in other than capricious ways demands knowledge of quality of performance which in turn is obtained only through evaluation procedures.

5. To provide the basis for in-service and supervisory activities.

6. To provide the basis for administrative decision. Defensible action must depend upon sound evidence in evaluation.

7. To provide the basis for judgments. Again evidence as to the quality and effectiveness of the service rendered must be present. This question of why evaluate is oftentimes reworded to ask "to what purpose should we employ the results of our evaluation of instruction."

It is often recommended that if the use of evaluation to improve instruction could in some way be separated from its use in making administrative decisions pertaining to salary, promotion recognition, etc., the possibility of its being accepted would be greatly enhanced. While it is recognized that some dedicated instructors will expend great amounts of time in improving the instruction taking place in their courses because of their professional commitment and their desire to do a better job, it appears that as long as the reward system of an institution is based on criteria not related to teaching effectiveness there is little hope that significant gains throughout the institution are going to be realized. If the improvement of instructional effectiveness is as important as we are claiming it to be, then there is no reason to avoid making administrative decisions based on the degree to which the instructor can demonstrate his effectiveness in arriving at stated objectives. Administrators today are making these decisions based on criteria oftentimes far removed from the major purposes of the institution and, thereby, contribute to the devaluation of teaching and make it extremely difficult to mount a program to improve student learning in the institution.

Each institution must first establish its own goals and objectives and be able to clearly interpret them to students, faculty, trustees, and community. Each institution must be able to measure fairly and accurately the degree to which the established course goals and objectives have been met by students in order to grade, thus recognize and reward them. Each institution must then be able to determine the degree to which faculty members contribute to the attainment of those goals by the students, and this should become the basis on which the institution's reward system is based.

Most evidence in the area of who should be involved in the evaluation procedure seems to point out the inadvisability of using only one source of information or one group of evaluators to gather information. The two studies by Gustad, one in 1961 and the other in 1966 sponsored by the American Council on Education, shows the sources of information employed by junior colleges as well as universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers colleges in the evaluation of teaching. As can be observed from these data (tables in appendix), evaluation activities carried on by the dean or chairman constituted the first and second most important sources in 1966 for community colleges as compared with classroom visits and informal student opinions in 1961. What should be of concern to groups developing evaluation procedures is that every indication points to the fact that if this activity is not performed adequately by those groups within the institution who have responsibility in these areas then outside groups who are demanding financial accountability will find it expedient to step in and perform this task.

Arguments can be raised for the validity of using academic administrators to perform this function certainly if they are going

to be held accountable for the student learning which takes place in their institution. The systems approach to education, the new learning technology, and certainly the emerging learning corporations are going to cause these administrators to re-examine their responsibilities in the area of providing leadership for student learning.

The use of students as evaluators of instructional effectiveness has been well documented. It is true that this is the only group having daily contact with the process and most assuredly the only group that can make valid evaluations concerning how they feel about the process. The weaknesses often cited, that of lack of competency, lack of maturity, and inability to see the overall function of the instructor, pose real limitations on the use of this group of evaluators.

Colleagues provide another source of potential evaluators of instruction primarily because they possess the esoteric knowledge of the subject matter and are in the best position to judge the instruction as a total activity. The use of colleagues from outside the institution, a group of experts, might tend to eliminate some of the objections created by too intimate a contact between evaluator and evaluatee. A team of evaluators in a particular discipline area might be able to provide objective standards against which instruction in any one institution might be judged and might be less prone to "sugar coat" weaknesses seen among colleagues within the institution. Certainly the possibility of evaluators coming in from outside either the institution or the discipline cannot be taken lightly. Many groups now responsible for providing funds for instruction are potential sources of evaluators of the effectiveness of that instruction. If nothing else, the spector of these groups should motivate those now responsible for evaluating instruction to greater effort.

The most obvious problem in identifying criteria to be used in evaluation is the discrepancy between what is claimed to be the basis for evaluating and what is actually used.

From the results of the survey of current practices in the evaluating of college teachers reported on by Calvin B. T. Lee in the Junior College Journal (table in appendix), it is quite obvious that classroom teaching is viewed as being extremely important in evaluating community college faculty members for recognition and reward. The validity which can be assigned to these data remain doubtful; however, as one also sees universities making the same claim when it is so well known that this is not the basis on which they promote, adjust salaries, or offer tenure.

If community colleges do in fact, as indeed they should, almost unanimously use classroom teaching as a criterion for evaluating

faculty, then it is imperative that these criterion be clearly identified, appropriately acceptable, and measurable. Evaluation of classroom teaching might focus on either instructor performance or student performance or on both. Regardless of which is used, the institution must establish a set of expected behaviors for the instructor and/or learner and a means of measuring that behavior. The criteria to be selected will, in the final analysis, be the result of the philosophy held by the institution regarding what it believes its purpose to be.

More and more evidence seems to point to the idea that student performance represents the ends which we are trying to achieve and that the means, teacher performance, should not be of central concern and certainly not be used exclusively as the basis for reward. Until and unless it can be shown that there is a causal relationship between what the teacher does or perhaps the specific manner in which he does it and student performance, the former should not be the primary basis for reward.

If instructor performance criteria are used, it can be expected that movement will be made in the direction of those instructor behaviors which have been identified as desirable and away from those identified as undesirable. The study by Ryans would be one example of the direction which personality traits might be expected to move. The evaluation form found in the appendix of this report identifies, in addition to personal attributes, classroom teaching behavior, evidence of scholarly and professional performance, and college and public service activities which will provide the structure for movement.

If student performance criteria are used, it can be expected that patterns of institutions will move in the direction which will produce the kind of student behavior identified as most desirable and away from those things which do not contribute to those kinds of student behavior.

The spector of invasion of privacy and transgressing on academic freedom are brought to the fore when the issues of what instruments, techniques, or approaches should be used in evaluating instruction in institutions of Higher Education. Research reported by Medley and Mitzel in the "Handbook of Research on Teaching", relating to measuring classroom behavior by systematic observation, stress the point that it " . . . is not a pastime for amateurs; it is a full-time occupation for technically competent professionals."

The approach which seems to hold the greatest promise in terms of both being effective and reducing the tension created by the threat of biased, capricious, invalid observation is that of electronic recording systems. If these audio-visual recordings can be made without unduly disturbing normal class routine, a most objective record is available on which judgments can be made concerning teacher performance.

In the area of student performance, the systems approach to instruction with its behaviorist objectives and new teaching technoligies needs to be given close attention.

FACULTY EVALUATION

Evaluation involves judging whether something which we know measures up to what we expect of it. This means that in every evaluation we must have a standard or criterion against which to judge, and we must have an idea or a description of the object, person, act, or whatever it is that we would evaluate.

PURPOSES OF EVALUATION

1. To determine achievement of the objectives held by the school. Those responsible need to be aware of the successes and failures in the program.

2. To provide the basis for giving recognition for superior and effective service.

3. To provide the basis for self-improvement. The evaluated instructor needs evidence of his strengths and weaknesses; those responsible need the same evidence to encourage and aid improvement or take indicated action.

4. To provide the basis for motivation. Uses of incentives in other than capricious ways demands knowledge of quality of performance, which in turn is obtained only through evaluation procedures.

5. To provide the basis for in-service and supervisory activities.

6. To provide the basis for administrative decision. Defensible action must depend upon sound evidence and evaluation.

7. To provide the basis for judgments. Again evidence as to the quality and effectiveness of service rendered must be present.

EVALUATION GUIDELINES

1. The chief goal of an evaluation program is improvement and growth; to attain this goal fully, every member should have the benefit of periodic evaluation.

2. Faculty should be informed on school policies concerning evaluation, especially on criteria, frequency, and the rights and responsibilities of everyone concerned with the program.

3. Every formal evaluation should be preceded by observations and conferences sufficient to enable the persons concerned to have confidence that the evaluation is based on adequate knowledge and understanding of the work being evaluated.

4. There should be genuine cooperative participation by all those concerned in the evaluation.

5. The criteria of effective teaching behavior should be established and should be clearly understood by raters and instructor alike. These criteria of teaching effectiveness should be translated into appropriate rating instruments.

6. Special attention should be given to problems of new or probationary instructors to see that they receive the help and guidance they need.

7. Procedures should be clearly established and each person should become aware of his role and the role of each other person involved.

8. Procedures must be evaluated and revised periodically.

9. There should be some form of appeal procedures for those who feel that their ratings do them injustice.

10. Raters should be trained in observational and rating techniques and in the use of the specific instruments.

11. Since written evaluations take much time and effort, forms should be designed so that their completion is as rapid and efficient as practicable. Completed evaluations should be fully utilized by those responsible.

12. Those who participate in evaluation activities should expect to be evaluated on how well they do it.

SUGGESTED STEPS IN FACULTY EVALUATION PROCEDURE

1. Completion of a self-evaluation by the faculty member culminating in a report which is forwarded to department chairman.

2. Initial evaluation by department chairman.

3. Conference between faculty member and department chairman (cooperative evaluation).

4. Final evaluation of faculty member by department chairman and transmittal to the Dean.

5. Summary evaluation prepared and forwarded to the status committee.

6. Dean confers with status committee and final decisions are made on promotions, merit increases, special recognitions, etc.

Department _____ Date _____ Name _____

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

These are criteria for faculty evaluation with suggested documentary evidence to support the rating on each criterion. These items should serve to (1) spell out faculty qualifications beyond the general requirements for promotion to each rank as outlined in the faculty handbook, and (2) provide a basis for evaluation for any other purposes such as merit increase in salary. Objective, documented evidence should be used to the fullest extent in making ratings on these criteria. It is recognized that judgment must be made ultimately, but it should be documented judgment. While all included items contribute something to a faculty member's total effectiveness, it is assumed that no one faculty member need rank high on all criteria. In fact, it is not necessary that the faculty member be rated on every individual item. <u>It is the total evaluation that is important.</u>

While miscellaneous factors such as length of time in rank, total work load, unusually distinguished service to the college, or competing offers might be considered in any specific case, these documented ratings must not be overlooked.

Key to ratings: A = outstanding, B = above average, C = average, D = needs improvement, NA = not applicable.

CLASSROOM TEACHING

Rating	Criteria	Evidence
A B C D NA	1. Organizing and planning courses around clearly defined course objectives	A. Course outlines or other written material on file B. Statements of course objectives C. Plans for achieving objectives in each course D. Conference with chairman
A B C D NA	2. Motivation of students	A. Student achievement B. Student evaluation data
A B C D NA	3. Communicating ideas in clear, forceful, orderly manner	A. Classroom visits by colleagues and administration B. Student evaluation data

Rating	Criteria	Evidence
A B C D NA	4. Evaluating student progress	A. Samples of tests given and method of grading B. Fairness in grading C. Student evaluation data
A B C D NA	5. Continued evaluation of own performance	A. Evidence of some form of self-evaluation used by instructor B. Evidence of use of student evaluation C. Innovations and study of effective methods of teaching
A B C D NA	6. Reflection of current scholarship in teaching	A. Adaptation in classroom methods and subject matter
A B C D NA	7. Post-college performance of instructor's students	A. Reports from graduate schools B. Alumni reports and evaluations

SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

A B C D NA	1. Continued growth in field (must be in teaching field or related field)	A. Transcripts or report of courses completed B. Written report of workshops and conferences attended C. Attendance at meetings in own field D. Report of self-initiated efforts and projects

Rating	Criteria	Evidence
A B C D NA	2. Publication in own field or other significant contribution pertinent to his field	A. Acceptance of article for publication or a reprint B. Acceptance of book by publisher C. Public exhibit or performance
A B C D NA	3. Professional research	A. Contracts and grants B. Written report on projects in progress or completed
A B C D NA	4. Participation in professional organizations and societies	A. Evidence of active membership B. Offices or responsible positions held C. Appearance on programs (paper, panel speaker) D. Where opportunities are limited, a statement to this effect and evidence of what has been done
A B C D NA	5. Contributions to departmental objectives	A. Effectiveness in furthering dept. objectives in work with students B. Faithfulness in attendance and contribution in dept. meetings, activities C. Cooperativeness
A B C D NA	6. Recognition by colleagues in professional field	. Awards, citations, or other recognition
A B C D NA	7. Related experience (professional, industrial, etc. if related to field)	Description

COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Rating	Criteria	Evidence
A B C D NA	1. Helpfulness in guiding and assisting students	A. Load of student advisees B. Evidence of availability to students (e.g., office hours, adequate hours for appointments, extra-class discussions, etc.) C. Student evaluation (items such as: "Do you feel the instructor is "approachable" or "Does instructor show an interest in your problem?" or "Do you find the instructor helpful with your difficulties?"
A B C D NA	2. Assumption of reasonable share of faculty responsibilities (departmental, council, faculty committees, etc.)	A. Appearance at committee, departmental, or council meetings and perhaps evaluation by chairman B. In the case of the chairman, a statement from the person to whom he reports C. Evidence that he willingly assumes responsibility for his assigned duties
A B C D NA	3. Participation in campus community life	A. Advisorship of departmental or campus student organizations B. Appearance at campus functions of the student body and faculty

Rating	Criteria	Evidence
A B C D NA	4. Community activities (e.g., academic meetings, service club speaker, community service, speaking engagements in own field, etc.)	A. Public relations communications or report to Dept. Head submitted by faculty member indicating his appearance in public or community events B. Appearing as representative of college at meetings not necessarily his own field
A B C D NA	5. Consultation in the area of competence	Contract or agreements reported by faculty member
	PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES[1]	
A B C D NA	1. Intellectual vigor	A. Observable contributions to department and college not covered elsewhere B. Innovations and activities demonstrating spontaneity and creativity
A B C D NA	2. Integrity	A. Reputation with colleagues B. Reputation with others
A B C D NA	3. Personality	A. Judgment of departmental colleagues B. Student evaluations C. Judgments of other responsible and capable persons

[1]Recommended that criteria in the first two categories be weighed most heavily and those in the last category weight the least.

COMMENTS

FACULTY EVALUATION

Department Chairman's Rating Sheet

Department _____

Evaluator _____ Individual rated _____

Evaluator should note the paragraphs on the Faculty Evaluation Form before proceeding with these ratings

CLASSROOM TEACHING

Rating		Criterion
A B C D NA	1.	Ability to organize subject matter
A B C D NA	2.	Clear statement of course objectives and development of means for attaining them
A B C D NA	3.	Effective performance in classroom (teaching techniques, motivation of students, etc.)
A B C D NA	4.	Student evaluation of assignments, tests, grade interpretation and standards as fair and reasonable
A B C D NA	5.	Continued evaluation of own performance
A B C D NA	6.	Reflection of current scholarship in teaching
A B C D NA	7.	Post-college performance of instructor's students

SCHOLARLY AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCE

A B C D NA	1.	Continued growth in field (must be in teaching field or related field)
A B C D NA	2.	Publication in own field or other significant contribution pertinent to his field
A B C D NA	3.	Professional research
A B C D NA	4.	Participation in professional organizations and societies
A B C D NA	5.	Contribution to departmental objectives
A B C D NA	6.	Recognition by colleagues in professional field
A B C D NA	7.	Related experience (professional, industrial, etc., if related to field).

COLLEGE AND PUBLIC SERVICES

Rating		Criterion
A B C D NA	1.	Teaching load
A B C D NA	2.	Helpfulness in guiding and assisting students
A B C D NA	3.	Assumption of reasonable share of faculty responsibilities (departmental, council, faculty committees, etc.)
A B C D NA	4.	Participation in campus community life
A B C D NA	5.	Community activities (e.g., academic meetings, service club speaker, community service, speaking engagements in own field, etc.)
A B C D NA	6.	Consultation in area of competence

PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES[1]

A B C D NA	1.	Intellectual vigor
A B C D NA	2.	Integrity
A B C D NA	3.	Personality

[1]Recommended that criteria in the first two categories be weighed most heavily and those in the last category weighed least.

COMMENTS

TABLE I

IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS FACTORS IN EVALUATING FACULTY FOR PROMOTION, SALARY, OR TENURE

Source of information	Percentage of deans checking item as a "major factor"								
				University colleges					
	Junior colleges (N=128)	Teachers colleges (N=133)	Liberal arts colleges (N=484)	Arts and sciences (N=110)	Education (N=48)	Engineering (N=109)	Business (N=65)	Agriculture (N=33)	All colleges (N=1,110)
Classroom teaching	98.2	94.0	97.6	93.6	91.7	93.7	95.3	93.8	95.9
Personal attributes	69.2	53.8	61.3	33.7	46.8	53.9	50.0	70.0	56.8
Length of service in rank	63.3	47.4	59.9	21.3	33.3	24.3	18.8	46.9	47.4
Student advising	42.5	37.7	46.8	20.2	38.3	29.6	22.2	62.5	39.5
Campus committee work	41.5	35.6	32.6	15.7	21.3	13.9	21.9	34.4	29.2
Activity in professional societies	18.3	28.2	23.9	19.8	33.3	28.4	35.9	31.3	25.3
Public service	15.7	22.0	16.1	23.2	48.9	14.8	29.7	43.8	20.5
Supervision of honors program[a]	4.3	2.5	14.3	21.7	3.2	11.5	10.3	12.5	12.4
Outside consulting	4.0	12.3	2.4	2.8	17.4	5.7	6.4	9.4	5.3
Competing job offers	3.1	10.9	9.8	31.1	10.4	16.8	15.6	31.3	13.2
Research	1.0	27.1	31.7	92.7	79.2	82.0	84.4	87.5	46.6
Publication	1.0	22.0	24.5	83.3	70.8	70.9	82.8	80.7	39.9
Supervision of graduate study[a]	—	16.0	17.8	55.2	52.2	59.6	38.7	61.3	40.8

[a] Percentages are actually based on considerably smaller N's because of the relatively high number of deans who checked "not applicable."

TABLE II

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH VARIOUS SOURCES OF EVALUATIVE INFORMATION ARE USED IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF INSTITUTIONS

Source of Information	Percent reporting use in all or most departments							
				University colleges				
	Junior colleges (N=128)	Teachers colleges (N=133)	Liberal arts colleges (N=484)	Arts and sciences (N=110)	Education (N=48)	Engineering (N=109)	Business (N=65)	Agriculture (N=33)
Dean evaluation	82.7	80.5	83.5	71.8	91.7	80.4	89.1	84.4
Chairman evaluation	65.8	89.6	82.2	98.2	91.3	92.7	88.7	93.9
Classroom visits	42.2	25.8	9.8	2.0	4.4	8.7	5.2	3.0
Course syllabi and examinations	37.0	28.6	29.4	5.9	11.1	22.8	22.6	39.4
Informal student opinions	33.6	28.0	47.2	35.0	48.9	42.5	47.6	28.1
Grade distributions	30.6	27.7	36.0	15.5	9.3	18.5	19.4	15.3
Colleagues' opinions	29.2	34.9	50.6	62.0	48.9	53.8	71.9	46.9
Long-term follow-up of students	26.1	6.2	9.9	1.0	9.1	13.5	1.6	9.4
Self-evaluation or report	22.3	14.8	15.4	11.0	27.3	11.9	26.3	12.9
Student examination performance	21.6	16.2	24.7	12.9	4.6	15.5	20.0	9.4
Systematic student ratings	16.1	4.9	11.2	11.3	13.0	14.0	20.6	26.5
Committee evaluation	15.7	17.3	28.9	30.8	28.9	23.3	30.0	6.3
Alumni opinions	8.2	8.7	11.2	2.9	2.3	13.3	16.7	9.4
Enrollment in elective courses	6.8	7.8	14.0	11.5	2.3	8.8	14.8	3.2
Scholarly research and publication	4.2	34.1	36.6	70.0	63.8	72.9	75.0	56.3